

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 33	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 21-Apr-2003		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY A-E & CONSTRUCTION BRANCH 100 W. OGLETHORPE AVE SAVANNAH GA 31401-3640		CODE DACA21		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DACA21-03-R-0006	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Mar-2003	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>3</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) PROJECT: INDEFINITE DELIVERY ORDER CONTRACT, SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN LAKES AND DAMS AND FORT GORDON, GEORGIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA POC: donna.s.knight@sas02.usace.army.mil SEE PAGE 2							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 21-Apr-2003	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION 00100 - BIDDING SCHEDULE/INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

Section 00100**INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICE TO OFFERORS****INDEFINITE DELIVERY CONTRACT (IDC)****FOR****CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN/BUILD CONSTRUCTION****PERFORMANCE PRICE TRADE-OFF**

1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW. This Request for Proposal (RFP) is to solicit an Indefinite Delivery, Multi-Task Construction and Design/Build Construction Contract for repairs, additions, and alterations to buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems; and new construction of buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems construction tasks. Work will be performed primarily at facilities associated with the Lakes and Dams of the Savannah River Basin and Fort Gordon, GA. Work may also be located at other Federal Facilities within the geographic boundaries of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers South Atlantic Division. The task orders will be Firm Fixed Price Construction (FFP-C) or Firm Fixed Price Design/Build (FFP-D/B). In unusual and rare circumstances and with the Contracting Officer's approval, task orders may be issued with a final definitive scope of work and an independent government estimate leading to a fixed price to be negotiated at a later date.

1.1 General. Inasmuch as the proposal shall describe the capability of the Offeror to perform any resultant contract, it should be specific and complete in every detail. The proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of capabilities to satisfactorily perform the contract being sought. The proposal should therefore be practical, legible, clear and coherent. The process used for this solicitation will be a Request for Proposal (RFP) Best Value, (See Federal Acquisition Regulation 15.101). The evaluation criteria will include Construction-Past Performance, Construction-Experience, Construction-Capacity, Design-Specialized Experience, Design-Staffing and Professional Qualifications, and Design-Knowledge of Locality.

1.2 Proposal Submissions and the Best Value Trade-Off Process. This process requires potential contractors to submit their performance and capability information initially for review and consideration by the Government. The technical information contained in the proposal shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Government in accordance with the evaluation criteria set out in this Section. Relative weights among technical factors are provided in paragraph 4.1 Relative Importance. Following the review, evaluation, and rating of these proposals, the Government will evaluate price proposals for Offerors that have acceptable technical proposals. The Government shall evaluate Price from the Offerors' proposed price of a sample project task order. In addition to the price of the sample project task order, the Offerors' proposed Field Overhead, Home Office Overhead, Field Office Overhead on Subcontractor's Work, and Bond Premium shall be evaluated. Offerors will be required to separately submit their price proposals. Price will not be scored, but will be a factor in establishing the competitive range prior to discussions and in making the final best value determination for award.

2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**2.1 Who May Submit.**

2.1.1 Proposals may be submitted by firms formally organized as design/build entities, or by construction contractors and design firms that have associated specifically for this contract. For the purpose of this solicitation, no distinction is made between formally organized design/build entities and contract-specific design/build associations. Both are referred to as the design/build offeror, (or simply "Offeror"), or the design/build contractor, (or simply "Contractor"), after award of a contract.

2.1.2 Any legally organized Offeror may submit a proposal.

2.2 **Where to Submit.** Offerors shall submit their proposal packages to the Savannah District at the address shown in Block 7 of Standard Form 1442.

2.3 **Submission Deadline.** Proposals shall be received by the Savannah District no later than the time and date specified in Block 13 of Standard Form 1442.

2.4 General Requirements.

2.4.1 In order to effectively and equitably evaluate all proposals, the Contracting Officer must receive information sufficiently detailed to allow review and evaluation by the Government.

2.4.2 **Tabs.** Proposal shall be organized and tabbed as shown in paragraph 2.5 Submission Format.

2.4.3 Size of Printed Matter Submissions.

2.4.3.1 Written materials shall be on 8-1/2" x 11" paper.

2.4.3.2 The proposals shall contain a detailed table of contents. If more than one binder is used, the complete table of contents shall be included in each. Any materials submitted but not required by this solicitation, (such as company brochures), shall be relegated to appendices.

2.4.4 **Number of Copies.** Offerors shall submit one (1) hard copy of Volume I and five (5) hard copies of Volume II of their Proposal. Both volumes shall also be submitted on a CD-ROM.

2.5 Submission Format.

2.5.1 The Proposal will be tabbed and submitted in a three ring binders in the following format:

PROPOSAL

VOLUME I

TAB A
SF 1442

TAB B
Section 00600 – Representations and Certifications

TAB C
PROPOSAL DATA SHEET – include Offeror's telephone number, FAX number, DUNS number, Architect-Engineer ACASS number, and Offeror's CCASS number

TAB D
Sample Project Task Order Fee Proposal Sheet with Attachments

TAB E
Sample Project Task Order Bid Bond

VOLUME II

TAB A – FACTOR 1: CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE
Past Performance Questionnaire

TAB B – FACTOR 2: CONSTRUCTION - EXPERIENCE
Project Information Sheets

TAB C – FACTOR 3: CONSTRUCTION - CAPACITY
Current Contracts Status Information
Management Plan

TAB D – FACTOR 4: DESIGN – SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL
COMPETENCE

FACTOR 5: DESIGN – STAFFING & PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

FACTOR 6: DESIGN – KNOWLEDGE OF LOCALITY

STANDARD FORM 254/255

TAB E – OTHER INFORMATION. Offerors shall submit any other information under TAB E.
Information submitted under TAB E may not be considered by the Government.

2.5.2 Price Proposal Information. Offerors shall complete the Sample Project Task Order Offeror Fee Proposal Sheet and furnish the original in a separate envelope labeled “PRICE PROPOSAL” as TAB D of Volume I. **The technical proposal shall not include any cost information.**

3. PROPOSAL AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

3.1 The Evaluation Team will evaluate each proposal individually using the qualitative/quantitative procedures that follow. Each proposal will be reviewed and rated by each of the evaluators. During this process, discrepancies between evaluations will be discussed and resolved within the team. Following the completion of the individual evaluations, a consensus evaluation will be derived.

3.1.1 Worksheets are provided on the following pages that the evaluators will use to review and rate the individual proposals.

3.1.2 During the consensus evaluation, a single “consensus rating” worksheet shall be completed for each proposal and signed by all the evaluators.

3.1.3 Comments and supporting rationale for the rating assigned will be included on this consensus sheet.

3.2 VOLUME II TAB A - FACTOR 1: CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE. Offerors shall be evaluated on SABRE, JOC, IDC Construction and/or IDC Design/Build type contracts successfully completed or substantially completed in the last three years with the contracts performed falling within the range of \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000. The Offeror’s past performance in completing task orders during the last three years will be evaluated to determine technical capability to perform the proposed contract and how well it satisfied its customers. The information presented in the Offeror’s submittal, together with that from other sources available to the Government will comprise the input for evaluation of this factor. The following elements will be evaluated:

- Quality of Construction
- Timeliness of Performance
- Customer Satisfaction
- Sub-contractor Management

3.2.1 Offeror’s Submission Requirements. Offeror’s shall identify three completed contracts (or substantially complete) as described above to be used for reference and evaluation purposes and provide a questionnaire to the

Point of Contact for each contract listed. A sample Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire is included at the end of this section. When completed, these forms shall be mailed or e-mailed to the Savannah District Contract Specialist identified in the sample transmittal letter provided. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that the reference documentation is provided, as the Government may not make additional requests for past performance information from the references. Copies of the evaluation form shall be provided to the Savannah District Contract Specialist directly from the reference. Contracts from which questionnaires are received shall have been completed or substantially completed within three years of the date of this solicitation. The Government may contact sources other than those provided by the Offeror for information with respect to past performance. These other sources may include CCASS (Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System), telephone interviews with organizations familiar with the Offeror's performance, and Government personnel with personal knowledge of the Offeror's performance capability.

3.2.2 Evaluation. The Government will evaluate the offeror's past performance using the sources available to it including the example contracts identified by the Offeror, Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires received, and CCASS. Offerors may be provided an opportunity to address any negative past performance information about which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. The Government treats an Offeror's lack of past performance as having no positive or negative evaluation significance. The Government will evaluate past performance based on the elements listed below:

Quality of Construction. Based on information provided in the questionnaire and other information, the Government will assess the quality of the actual construction undertaken and the standards of workmanship exhibited by the Offeror's team.

Timeliness of Performance. The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror completing past projects within the scheduled completion times.

Customer Satisfaction. The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's past customer satisfaction, cooperation with customers, and interaction on past projects.

Subcontractor Management. The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's management of subcontractors on past projects.

3.3 VOLUME II TAB B - FACTOR 2: CONSTRUCTION – EXPERIENCE. Offerors shall be evaluated on SABRE, JOC, and IDC Construction and Design/Build type contracts successfully completed or substantially completed in the last three years that demonstrate the offeror's specialized experience in the construction of repairs, additions, and alterations to buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems; and new construction of buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems. The majority of the task orders submitted by the Offeror for evaluation should fall within the range of \$25,000 to \$750,000.

3.3.1 Offeror's Submission Requirements. Offerors shall submit Project Information Sheets of construction and design/build type IDC task orders completed, including those in progress during the last three years, listing all completed task orders separately that reflect specialized experience in the construction elements referenced in paragraph 3.3 above. As a minimum, the Project Information Sheets will provide project Point of Contact with telephone number, general character, scope, location, cost, and date of completion of each task order.

3.3.2 Evaluation. The Government will review the list of example task orders provided by the Offeror to evaluate and rate the recent relevant experience of the Offeror with similar projects. The example task orders that most closely resemble repairs, additions, and alterations to buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems; and new construction of buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems projects will receive the highest consideration. If the Offeror cannot provide suitable relevant experience and the evaluators consider that the information provided indicates that the Offeror has no relevant experience, a determination will be made as to the risk this lack of corporate experience presents to the Government and the proposal will be evaluated accordingly.

3.4 VOLUME II TAB C – FACTOR 3: CONSTRUCTION – CAPACITY. The successful Offeror will be expected to manage a large number of task orders simultaneously requiring a very high level of management skills

using a management structure solely dedicated to the contract. This factor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's current contract capacity, understanding, and capability of successfully managing multiple contracts at multiple locations to their completion.

3.4.1 Offeror's Submission Requirements. Offerors shall submit a list of current JOC, SABRE, or IDC Construction type contracts providing the contract agency, agency POC, contract number, total contract capacity, remaining contract capacity, number of performance periods, current performance period, current performance period completion date, and contract completion date. Offerors shall submit a well-defined management plan from start to contract completion, showing (a) organization charts, (b) levels of personnel authority, (c) internal controls, (d) resume of individuals specifically involved with the work; as a minimum the Program Manager, Project Manager/s, Project Engineer/s, Project Superintendent/s, Contract Administrator, Quality Control Manager, and Safety Engineer (e) narrative describing plan functionality to include (1) management cooperation/responsiveness, (2) job site supervision, and (3) coordination/control of subcontractors, and (f) proposed response times for (1) initial call to attend site meeting, (2) proposal preparation time, and (3) start of work. Proposed response times shall address both normal and urgent conditions.

3.4.2 Evaluation. The Government will review the list of current JOC, SABRE, and IDC Construction type contracts provided by the Offeror to evaluate the Offeror's current contract capacity. The Government will review the Offeror's management plan to evaluate the Offeror's proposed contract management, responsiveness, effective job site supervision, coordination and control of subcontractors, and experienced and dedicated contract team.

3.5 VOLUME II TAB D - FACTOR 4: DESIGN – SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL COMPETENCE. This factor evaluates the offeror's specialized experience and technical competence in: (a) Design of repairs, additions, and alterations to buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems; and design of new construction of buildings, roads, drainage systems and utility systems. (b) Topographic surveying. (c) Shop drawing review, construction phase services, and preparation of O&M manuals. (d) Preparation of design files in (*.dgn) formats. Offerors will be evaluated on a comprehensive list of Design Build Construction IDIQ contract and/or Architect-Engineer IDIQ type contracts completed including those in progress in the last three years.

3.5.1 Offeror's Submission Requirements. Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm listing all task order Architect-Engineer and task order design/build contracts completed including those in progress during the last three years that reflect experience in elements a-d of paragraph 3.5.

3.5.2 Evaluation. The Government will review the Offeror's Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm, and/or may communicate with the points of contact listed by the Offeror, and/or may communicate with others selected by the Government. The Government will evaluate all information available to determine depth of experience and competence in the elements a-d.

3.6 VOLUME II TAB D - FACTOR 5: DESIGN – STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS. This factor evaluates the offeror's staffing and professional qualifications (appropriate training, education, experience and professional registration) to provide the following engineering disciplines: Architecture, Structural Engineer, Civil Engineer, Electrical Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer, Industrial Hygienist (Asbestos and Lead Paint Abatement Specialist) and Topographic Surveyor/Crew. It is critical that the Design portion of the design/build partnership has the staffing and qualifications in all disciplines for which work is anticipated. Lack of staffing and qualifications may result in lack of efficiency and delays during accomplishment of task orders when engineering disciplines are being added to accomplish design.

3.6.1 Offeror's Submission Requirements: Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm.

3.6.2 Evaluation. The Government will review the Offeror's Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm, and/or may communicate with the points of contact listed by the Offeror, and/or may communicate with others selected by the

Government. The Government will evaluate all information available to identify staffing and professional qualifications in the required engineering discipline elements of paragraph 3.6.

3.7 VOLUME II TAB D – FACTOR 6: DESIGN – KNOWLEDGE OF LOCALITY: This factor will evaluate the offeror's knowledge of the locality as it pertains to familiarity with design standards and practices in the South Atlantic Division. Offerors will be evaluated on a comprehensive list of all Design/Build Construction IDC contracts and other Architect-Engineer IDC type contracts completed and in progress in the last three years located in this area. For this solicitation, the Architect-Engineer firm proposed by the Offeror must be located within 180 miles of Ft Gordon.

3.7.1 Offeror's Submission Requirements: Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm listing all task order Architect-Engineer and task order design/build contracts completed including those in progress during the last three years, noting the project location and location of the Architect-Engineer firm's office.

3.7.2 Evaluation. The Government will review the Offeror's Standard Form 255 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and Standard Form 254 for prime Architect-Engineer firm and each consulting Architect-Engineer firm, and/or may communicate with the points of contact listed by the Offeror, and/or may communicate with others selected by the Government. The Government will evaluate all information available to determine the Offeror's knowledge and familiarity with design standards and practices in SAD.

3.8 PRICE. The Government will perform a price analysis of each Offeror's Sample Project Task Order Fee Proposal. Price analysis will be performed in accordance with FAR 15.401-1, to determine completeness, reasonableness, and understanding of the work. The evaluation will determine the adequacy of the offer in fulfilling the requirements of the proposal. Completeness addresses the extent to which the elements of the price proposal are consistent with the requirements of the proposal and the adequacy of the coverage of the specifications. Reasonableness will be established using historical price information, price competition information, the IGE, and any other pricing tools necessary.

3.8.1 Content of Price Proposal. In addition to the price for the sample project task order, the proposed Field Overhead, Field Overhead for Subcontractor Work, Home Office Overhead, and Bond Premium shall be evaluated for reasonableness. Upon award, the rates proposed will be incorporated into the contract and will be used for future task orders and task order modifications.

3.8.2 Sample Task Order. The sample project task order is Construct Comfort Station at Oconee Point Park, Lake Hartwell. The estimated cost range is between \$100,000 to \$400,000. The selected Offeror shall be awarded the sample project task order.

3.9 Evaluation Standards. Evaluation criteria (factors) will be rated using the following adjectival descriptions. Evaluators will apply the appropriate adjective to each criterion rated. The evaluator's narrative explanation must clearly establish that the Offeror's submittal meets the definitions established below.

3.9.1 OUTSTANDING - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and highest quality performance is anticipated. The Offeror possesses exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The Offeror's qualifications meet the fullest expectations of the Government. The offeror has convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans, and techniques that, when implemented, should result in highly effective and efficient performance under the contract which represents low risk to the Government. An assigned rating of "outstanding" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, the submittal contains no significant weaknesses, deficiencies or disadvantages. Offeror very significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **Very high probability of success.**

3.9.2 ABOVE AVERAGE - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Offeror possesses one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which

the Offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency, productivity, or quality. The Offeror's qualifications are responsive with minor weaknesses, but no major weaknesses noted. An assigned rating of "Above Average" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, any weaknesses noted are minor and should not seriously affect the offeror's performance. The submittal demonstrates that the requirements of the RFP are well understood and the approach will likely result in a high quality of performance which represents low risk to the Government. A rating of "Above Average" is used when there are no indications of exceptional features or innovations that could prove to be beneficial, or conversely, weaknesses that could diminish the quality of the effort or increase the risks of failure. Disadvantages are minimal. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Offeror fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Response exceeds a "Satisfactory" rating. **High probability of success.**

3.9.3 SATISFACTORY (Neutral) - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. Offeror presents an acceptable solution and meets minimum standard requirements. Offeror possesses few or no advantages or strengths. The Offeror's proposal contains weaknesses in several areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, the Offeror may satisfactorily complete the proposed tasks, but there is at least a moderate risk that it will not be successful. There is a good probability of success and that a fully acceptable level of performance will be achieved. Offeror meets all RFP requirements, presents a complete and comprehensive proposal, exemplifies an understanding of the scope and depth of the task requirements, and displays understanding of the Government's requirements. Offeror's response exceeds a "Marginal" rating. **No significant advantages or disadvantages.**

3.9.4 MARGINAL - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to marginally meet performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific factor. The assignment of a rating of "Marginal" indicates that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The offeror's qualifications demonstrate an acceptable understanding of the requirements of the RFP and the approach will likely result in an adequate quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Offeror displays low probability of success, although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. Offeror's response exceeds an "Unsatisfactory" rating. **Significant disadvantages.**

3.9.5 UNSATISFACTORY – Information submitted fails to meet performance or capability standards necessary for acceptable contractor performance. The Offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be Unsatisfactory. The submittal does not meet the minimum requirements of the RFP; requirements could only be met with major changes to the submittal. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved which represents high risk to the Government. The Offeror's qualifications have many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fail to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and, fail to meet many of the minimum requirements. The Offeror's qualifications are so unacceptable that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make them acceptable. **Very significant disadvantages.**

4. EVALUATION FACTORS and WEIGHTS

4.1 Relative Importance. Construction-Past Performance, Construction-Experience, and Construction-Capacity are equal in weight. Design-Specialized Experience, Design-Staffing and Professional Qualifications, and Design-Knowledge of Locality are equal in weight. Construction-Past Performance, Construction-Experience, and Construction-Capacity are individually significantly more important than Design-Specialized Experience and Technical Competence, Design-Staffing and Professional Qualifications, and Design-Knowledge of Locality.

4.2 Relative Importance Definition. For the purpose of this evaluation, the following terms will be used to establish the relative importance of the factors.

Significantly More Important: Criterion is at least two times greater in value than other criterion.

Equal: The criterion is of the same value or nearly the same as another criterion.

4.3 **Price.** Price will not be scored, but will be a factor in establishing the competitive range prior to discussions and in making the final best value determination for award.

5. OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING

5.1 Each member of the Government evaluation team will independently consider all information provided in the proposal. Once these individual analyses are completed, the team will meet and determine a rating for each of the evaluation factors by consensus decision.

5.2 Following completion of the consensus rating, each proposal will be assigned a single overall rating. This final overall rating, along with ratings on individual factors, will be provided to the Contracting Officer/Source Selection Authority.

5.3 The evaluation team will document sufficient strengths, weaknesses, and omissions to support the rating for each factor as well as the overall rating. Documentation and comments are required for all ratings.

6. BASIS FOR AWARD

6.1 In order to determine which proposal represents the best overall value, the Government will compare proposals to one another. The Government will award a contract to the responsible Offeror whose technical submittal and price proposal contains the combination of those criteria described in this document offering the best overall value to the Government. Best value will be determined by a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in this RFP.

6.2 All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined are approximately equal to cost or price.

6.3 As technical ratings and relative advantages and disadvantages become less distinct, differences in price between proposals are of increased importance in determining the most advantageous proposal. Conversely, as differences in price become less distinct, differences in scoring and relative advantages and disadvantages between proposals are of increased importance to the determination.

6.4 The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer. The right is also reserved to reject any and all offers. The basis of award will be a conforming offer, the price or cost of which may or may not be the lowest. If other than the lowest offer, it must be sufficiently more advantageous than the lowest offer to justify the payment of additional amounts.

6.5 Offerors are reminded to include their best technical and price terms in their initial offer and not to automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or be asked to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interests of the Government.

7. EXCEPTIONS

Exceptions to the contractual terms and conditions of the solicitation (e.g., standard company terms and conditions) may result in a determination to reject a proposal.

8. RESTRICTIONS

Incomplete proposals. Failure to submit all the data in the format indicated in this section may be cause for determining a proposal incomplete and, therefore, not considered for evaluation, and for subsequent award.

PROPOSAL DATA SHEET
INDEFINITE DELIVERY CONTRACT (IDC)
FOR
CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN/BUILD CONSTRUCTION

NOTE TO OFFERORS

This OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY PROPOSAL DATA SHEET must be completed and attached as the first page of the body of your proposal. The information required by this data sheet may be completed directly on this form or attached to the form as supplemental data sheets.

1. NAME OF OFFEROR.

Name of Offeror(s):

Offeror's Telephone Number:

Offeror's FAX Number:

If a joint venture or contractor-subcontractor association of firms, list the individual firms and briefly describe the nature of the association.

Firm 1:

Firm 2:

Nature of Association:

2. OFFEROR'S DUNS NUMBER.

(If more than one DUNS number is to be considered explain affiliation to offeror)

3. OFFEROR'S CCASS NUMBER.

4. ACASS identification number for design firm

5. AUTHORIZED NEGOTIATORS.

The offeror represents that the following persons are authorized to negotiate on its behalf with the Government in connection with this Request for Proposals (RFP).

[List names, titles, and telephone number of the authorized negotiator.]

Name of Person Authorized to Negotiate:

Negotiator's Address:

Negotiator's Telephone:

PROPOSAL DATA SHEET
(Continued)

6. FACTOR 1: CONSTRUCTION - PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.

6.1 On an attached sheet, provide information for the three SABRE, JOC, IDC Construction and/or IDC Design/Build type contracts in-progress or completed by the Offeror over the last three years, in the cost range of \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000, to be used for reference and evaluation purposes. These should be the same contracts for which questionnaires have been provided to the Procurement Point of Contact.

For each contract provide the following information:

Contract Title:

Location:

Contract number:

Nature of involvement in this project, i.e. General Contractor, subcontractor, designer:

Procuring activity:

Procurement point of contact and telephone number:

Number of Task Orders completed or in progress to date:

Total Contract Amount:

Remaining Contract Capacity:

Contract Expiration Date:

Address and telephone number of owner:

Indicate type of project (private sector, Government, planned unit development, etc.):

General character of the Task Orders:

Total Contract Amount Awarded to Date:

Total cost of all modifications:

6.2 On an attached sheet, list all contracts with the Government within the last three years. Indicate Government contract number and contracting agency (with contact names and telephone numbers).

6.3 You may provide additional information on your capabilities, but please be brief.

**SAMPLE TRANSMITTAL LETTER
AND
PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Date: _____

To: _____

We have listed your firm as a reference for work we have performed for you as listed below. Our firm has submitted a proposal under a contract advertised by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District titled Indefinite Delivery Contract for Construction and Design/Build Construction, Solicitation Number DACA21-03-R-0006. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), an evaluation of our firm's past performance will be completed by the Corps of Engineers. Your candid response to the attached questionnaire will assist the evaluation team in this process.

We understand that you have a busy schedule and your participation in this evaluation is greatly appreciated. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire as thoroughly as possible. Space is provided for comments. Understand that while the responses to this questionnaire may be released to the offeror, FAR 15.306 (e)(4) prohibits the release of the names of the persons providing the responses. Complete confidentiality will be maintained. Furthermore, a questionnaire has also been sent to _____ of your organization. Only one response from each office is required. If at all possible, we request that you individually answer this questionnaire and then coordinate your responses with that of _____, to develop a consensus on one overall response from your organization.

Please send your completed questionnaire to the following address to arrive NOT LATER THAN 2:00 PM, May 2, 2003.

U.S. Army Engineer District, Savannah
Contracting Division
CESAS-CT-C (Donna Knight)
100 West Oglethorpe Street
Savannah, Georgia 31402

The questionnaires can also be emailed to Donna.S.Knight@sas02.usace.army.mil. If you have questions regarding the attached questionnaire, or require assistance, please contact Donna Knight at 912-652-5504. Thank you for your assistance.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

INDEFINITE DELIVERY CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN/BUILD CONSTRUCTION

DACA21-03-R-0006

Upon completion of this form, please send directly to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the enclosed addressed envelope or email to Donna.S.Knight@SAS02.usace.army.mil.

Do not return this form to our offices. Thank you.

1. Contractor/Name & Address (City and State):

2. Type of Contract: SABRE _____ JOC _____
IDC _____ IDC Design/Build _____

3. Title of Contract/Contract Number/Contract Amount/Number of Task Orders Awarded/Remaining Contract Capacity:

4. Description of Work: (Attach additional pages as necessary)

5. Complexity of Work: High _____ Mid _____ Routine _____

6. Location of Work: _____

7. Date of Award: _____

8. Status: Base Period ____ Option Period 1 ____ Option Period 2 ____

Expiration Date _____

9. Name, address and telephone number of person completing this questionnaire:

Evaluate the contractor's performance in complying with the contract requirements, quality and the overall technical expertise demonstrated by the Contractor.

Outstanding Quality	
Above Average Quality	
Satisfactory Quality	
Marginal Quality	
Unsatisfactory Quality or Experienced Significant Quality Problems	

[illegible]

To what extent did the contractor meet the contract and/or individual task order schedules?

Outstanding Timeliness – Completed Substantially Ahead of Schedule	
Above Average Timeliness – Completed on Schedule with no Time Delays	
Satisfactory Timeliness – Completed on Schedule with Minor Delays Under Extenuating Circumstances	
Marginal Timeliness – Completed Behind Schedule	
Unsatisfactory Timeliness – Experienced Significant Delays without Justification	

[illegible]

Outstanding – Exceptionally Satisfied	
Above Average – Highly Satisfied	
Satisfactory – Satisfied	
Marginal – Somewhat Dissatisfied	
Unsatisfactory – Highly Dissatisfied	

[illegible]

Outstanding	
Above Average	
Satisfactory	
Marginal	
Unsatisfactory	

[illegible]

14. If given the opportunity, would you work with this contractor again?

Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

Comments to support Response (Required)

15 . OTHER COMMENTS:

Use the space below to provide other information related to the contractor's performance. This may include the contractor's selection and management of subcontractors, flexibility in dealing with contract challenges, their overall concern for the Government's interest (if applicable), project awards received, etc.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION - PAST PERFORMANCE

1. General: The Government will evaluate each Offeror's past performance to determine how well it satisfied its customers. Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the success of the Offeror based on the satisfaction of previous customers and clients as illustrated on the completed questionnaires.

Has Government received three completed questionnaires for this Offeror? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Do all the questionnaires received reflect contracts completed or substantially completed within the last 3 years?
☐ YES ☐ NO

2. CCASS Ratings: Contract Specialist shall provide CCASS Ratings for the Offeror.

Number of Ratings:	Outstanding	_____
	Above Average	_____
	Satisfactory	_____
	Marginal	_____
	Unsatisfactory	_____

OVERALL CCASS RATING. Select an appropriate overall rating for the CCASS evaluation information available:

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

Comments to support the OVERALL CCASS RATING:

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION - PAST PERFORMANCE
(Continued)

3. Relevant Evaluator Personal Knowledge: Has this evaluator had personal experiences with the offeror? If so, describe below:

4. Quality of Construction: Evaluators shall carefully evaluate the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the quality of the past contracts. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Quality of Construction below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror.

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

4.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to final Quality of Construction.

4.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to final Quality of Construction.

4.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE

(Continued)

5. Timeliness of Performance: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain customer satisfaction with the timeliness of performance on the past contracts. Based on that review, provide a rating for the timeliness of performance of the past contracts below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror.

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

5.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE

(Continued)

6. Customer Satisfaction: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the Offeror's cooperation and interactions on the past contracts. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror's cooperation on the past contracts below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror.

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

6.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Customer Satisfaction.

6.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Customer Satisfaction.

6.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE

(Continued)

7. Subcontractor Management: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the Offeror's Management of Subcontractors on the past contracts. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror's Subcontractor Management Skills on the past contracts below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror.

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

7.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

7.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

7.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 1
CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE
(Continued)

Factor 1 Past Performance Overall Rating

FACTOR 1-1 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	Description	Rating*	Comments
1.	Questionnaire Receipt	YES/NO	
2.	CCASS Rating		
3.	Personal Experience	N/A	No rating permitted here
4.	Quality of Construction		
5.	Timeliness of Performance		
6.	Customer Satisfaction		
7.	Sub-Contractor Management		
OVERALL FACTOR 1 RATING**			
<p>* Ratings may be either:</p> <p>Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory</p> <p>** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating.</p>			

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 2
CONSTRUCTION – EXPERIENCE

1. General: The Government will evaluate the depth and breadth of the Offeror's corporate experience on the basis of the number of times it has performed projects that were similar in nature, size, scope, and complexity as the work required by this RFP. Completed Project Information Sheets shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has the Government received completed Project Information Sheets for Experience for this Offeror?

____ YES ____ NO

COMMENTS:

Do all the Project Information Sheets received reflect projects completed or substantially completed within the last 3 years?

____ YES ____ NO

COMMENTS:

2. Offeror Similar Construction Projects Completed: The number and size of projects completed of similar scope required by this RFP in the last three (3) years.

/___/ Outstanding

/___/ Above Average

/___/ Satisfactory

/___/ Marginal

/___/ Unsatisfactory

2.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to experience.

2.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to experience.

2.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 3
CONSTRUCTION – CAPACITY

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the current and anticipated contracts of the Offeror. The Offeror's list of current SABRE, JOC, and IDC construction and/or design/build type contracts and completed Management Plan shall be used as a basis to for the evaluation of this factor.

Has the Government received the list of current SABRE, JOC, and IDC construction and/or design/build type contracts for this Offeror? ☐ YES ☐ NO

COMMENTS:

Has the Government received the Management Plan for this Offeror? ☐ YES ☐ NO

COMMENTS:

2. Management Plan Review: Evaluators shall carefully review the Management Plan provided for the required content and to ascertain the Offeror's ability to manage multiple tasks to their completion. The reviews may also included discussions with points of contact or others regarding the Offeror's Management capabilities. Based on this review, provide a rating for the Management Effectiveness. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror and the proposed project team.

☐ Outstanding

☐ Above Average

☐ Satisfactory

☐ Marginal

☐ Unsatisfactory

2.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to capacity.

2.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to capacity.

2.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 4
DESIGN –SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL COMPETENCE

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the Specialized Experience and Technical Competence of the Offeror based on the Standard Form 254/255 provided. The completed Standard Form 254/255 shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has Government Received the completed Standard Form 254/255 for this Offeror? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Does the Standard Form 254/255 received reflect projects completed or under design within the Last 3 Years?
☐ YES ☐ NO

2. Standard Form 254/255 Review: Evaluators shall carefully review the Standard Form 254/255 provided for the required content and to ascertain the Offeror's ability to show the depth of experience and competence in each of the identified elements. The review may included discussions with points of contact or others regarding the Offeror's experience. Based on this review, provide a rating for experience. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror and the proposed project team.

Specialized Experience and Technical Competence In:	Outstanding	Above Average	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
a. Design of repairs, additions, & alterations to buildings, roads, drainage systems, and utility system; design of new construction of buildings, roads, drainage systems, and utility systems					
b. Topographic Surveying					
c. Shop drawing review, construction phase services, & preparation of O&M Manuals					
d. Originating design files in dgn format					

2.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the Offeror with respect to Specialized Experience and Technical Competence.

2.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the Offeror with respect to Specialized Experience and Technical Competence.

2.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provide for this Offeror.

FACTOR 4 OVERALL RATING

☐ Outstanding ☐ Above Average ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Marginal ☐ Unsatisfactory

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 5
DESIGN – STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the Staffing and Professional Qualifications in the required engineering disciplines of the Offeror based on the Standard Form 254/255 provided. The completed Standard Form 254/255 shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has Government Received the completed Standard Form 254/255 for this Offeror? __ YES __ NO

2. Standard Form 254/255 Review: Evaluators shall carefully review the Standard Form 254/255 provided to ascertain the Offeror's staffing and professional qualifications in the required engineering disciplines. The review may also included discussions with points of contact or others. Based on this review, provide a rating for staffing and professional qualifications. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror and the proposed project team.

Design Discipline	Outstanding	Above Average	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Architectural					
Structural Engineer					
Civil Engineer					
Electrical Engineer					
Mechanical Engineer					
Fire Protection Engineer					
Industrial Hygienist					
Topographic Surveyor/Crew					

2.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the Offeror with respect to Staffing.

.

2.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the Offeror with respect to Capacity.

2.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

FACTOR 5 OVERALL RATING

/__ / Outstanding /__ / Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

**PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET
FACTOR 6**

DESIGN –KNOWLEDGE OF LOCALITY

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate Offeror's knowledge of locality as pertains to familiarity with design standards and practices in the area of South Atlantic Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The completed Standard Form 254/255 shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has Government Received the completed Standard Form 254/255 for this Offeror? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Does the Standard Form 254/255 submitted by the Offeror contain a list of Design/Build IDIQ Contracts and Architect-Engineer IDIQ type contracts completed and/or in progress in the last three years? ☐ YES ☐ NO

2. Standard Form 254/255 Review: Evaluators shall carefully review the Standard Form 254/255 provided to ascertain the Offeror's knowledge of locality and location. The review may also included discussions with points of contact or others. Based on this review, provide a rating for knowledge of locality. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the Offeror and the proposed project team.

Area of Knowledge	Outstanding	Above Average	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Georgia					
South Carolina					
North Carolina					

2.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the Offeror with respect to Knowledge of Locality.

2.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the Offeror with respect to Knowledge of Locality.

2.3 Other: Include any other comments/rationale to support the overall rating provided for this Offeror.

FACTOR 6 OVERALL RATING

☐ Outstanding ☐ Above Average ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Marginal ☐ Unsatisfactory

Offeror: _____

Evaluator: _____

SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Factor	Description	Rating*	Comments
1	CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE		
2	CONSTRUCTION – EXPERIENCE		
3	CONSTRUCTION – CAPACITY		
4	DESIGN – SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL COMPETENCE		
5	DESIGN – STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS		
6	DESIGN – KNOWLEDGE OF LOCALITY		
OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING			
<p>* Ratings may be either:</p> <p>Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory</p>			

Offeror: _____

CONSENSUS SUMMARY RATING CHART					
Factor	Description	Board Member 1	Board Member 2	Board Member 3	CONSENSUS
1	CONSTRUCTION – PAST PERFORMANCE				
2	CONSTRUCTION – EXPERIENCE				
3	CONSTRUCTION – CAPACITY				
4	DESIGN – SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL COMPETENCE				
5	DESIGN – STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS				
6	DESIGN – KNOWLEDGE OF LOCALITY				
OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING					
Ratings may be either: Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory					

Board Member 1_____
Board Member 2_____
Board Member 3_____
Board Chairperson

NOTES

SAMPLE PROJECT TASK ORDER IS VOLUME II OF II. OFFERORS ARE TO SUBMIT THE SAMPLE PROJECT TASK ORDER AS PER SECTION 00100 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.

1. Offerors should not complete the Bid Schedule at Section 00010 – Solicitation Contract Form.
2. The contract awarded pursuant to this solicitation will be an indefinite delivery indefinite quantity construction and design/build contract. Work will be provided on a task order basis. The task orders will be Firm Fixed Price Construction or Firm Fixed Price Design/Build.
3. In unusual and rare circumstances and with the Contracting Officer's approval, a task order may be issued with a final definitized scope of work, and Independent Government Estimate, and a fixed price to be further adjusted. (See Section 1080-6, paragraph 6.1.1.2). Costs associated with unpriced items in the Schedule will be determined as part of the establishment of each task order.
4. The Department of Labor has provided Davis Bacon Act labor rates for the state of Georgia and South Carolina where the majority of the work will be performed under this contract. Wage Determination for the Sample Task Order is included. After contract award Wage Determinations will be included with each Task Order issued.
5. OTHER THAN NORMAL WORKING HOURS: A percentage increase in labor rates for other than normal working hours will be negotiated for each task order and applied to only the working hours other than those hours, as indicated in Section 01501. Other than normal working hours will be directed within a task order.
6. The guaranteed minimum amount for the base period is \$60,000.00. For each option period, the guaranteed minimum will be \$30,000.00. The contract maximum will be \$9,000,000.00.
7. In accordance with FAR 52.216-18, Ordering, the schedule is hereby revised to include the following statement: Task Orders will only be issued by a duly warranted Contracting Officer, including facsimile and oral orders when determined appropriate by the Contracting Officer.
8. IAW 52.216-18 Ordering, task orders may be issued orally, by facsimile, or by electronic commerce methods when approved by the Contracting Officer.
9. Percentage Rates furnished for Field Overhead; Field Overhead for Subcontract Work; Home Office Overhead; and Bond Premium on the Sample Project Task Order will be used throughout the life of the contract.
10. Profit will be computed using Weighted Guidelines Method.
11. Field Overhead will include but is not limited to Field Supervision, Quality Control, Safety Officer, Tool and Minor Equipment, Field Office and Utilities, Storage Sheds/Enclosures, Workman's Compensation and Employer's Liability Insurance, Builder's Risk Insurance, Public Liability Insurance, Unemployment Tax, Social Security and Medicare, and Identification Badges.

(End of Summary of Changes)

The following items are applicable to this modification:

DACA21-03-R-0006, Indefinite Delivery Order Contract, Savannah River Basin Lakes and Dams and Fort Gordon, Georgia and South Carolina. The bid opening remains the same at 2:00 PM local time on 2 May 2003.

A. CONTRACTUAL CHANGES:

Section 00100 – Instructions, Conditions, and Notice to Offerors is replaced in its entirety.

Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/Instructions to Bidders – NOTES - Note 11 is added.

B. TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES: The revised sections listed below (Revised by Amendment No. 0003) are hereby added to and made a part of the solicitation. Revised or added information is underlined and deleted information is struck out. Revisions can be located in the appropriate volume of specifications by searching for an asterisk and amendment number (i.e., *1).

Revised Sections

Volume I:

01080

01320

01451

Volume II:

Sample Task Order – Offeror Fee Proposal

C. CONTRACT DRAWINGS: There are no drawing revisions issued with this amendment.